

REMARKS

Claims 151-154, 156-159, 161-164 and 202-205 were pending in this application. Claims 151-154, 156-159, 161-164 and 202-205 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,986,650 (hereinafter "Ellis") in view of Bedard U.S. Patent No. 5,801,747 (hereinafter "Bedard") and Herz et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,758,257 (hereinafter "Herz").

Applicants have amended claims 151, 152, 156, 157, 161, 162, 202, and 203 to more particularly define the invention. Support for these amendments can be found, for example, on page 4, lines 10-23 of applicant's specification.

Amended independent claims 151, 156, 161, and 202 refer to a method, systems, and machine-readable media for displaying video associated with programs and program listings. A user may sequentially browse program listings by selecting each program listing separately in an overlay display that is displayed while a current program is displayed on a first channel. The display of the program listings are limited based only on attributes of the currently viewed program. The user may adjust the relative importance of the program attributes that are used to limit the display of the program listings, wherein the adjustment of the relative importance is performed by adjusting a weight factor for each program attribute.

The Examiner contends that the combination of Ellis, Bedard, and Herz shows all of the elements of applicants' claims. However, applicants respectfully submit that whether taken alone or in combination Ellis, Bedard, and Herz do not show or suggest limiting which program listings are displayed in the display region based only on various attributes of the current program,

as specified by applicants' amended independent claims 151, 156, 161, and 202.

In sharp contrast to applicants' claimed technique for limiting the displayed listing based only on the attributes of the currently displayed program, Bedard and Herz only refer to systems that limit the displayed listings based on determining the user's preferences. These are two distinct techniques for limiting the program listings that are provided to the user. Further, applicants cannot find disclosure in Ellis that shows or suggests this element of applicants' amended independent claims 151, 156, 161, and 202.

Accordingly, because the combination of Ellis, Bedard, and Herz fails to show or suggest all of the elements of applicants' amended independent claims, applicants' respectfully request that the rejection of claims 151, 156, 161, and 202 be withdrawn.

Claims 152-154, 157-159, 162-164 and 203-205 depend from independent claims 151, 156, 161, and 202, respectively. For at least this reason, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 152-154, 157-159, 162-164 and 203-205 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, applicants submit that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Andrew Van Court", written over a horizontal line.

Andrew Van Court
Registration No. 48,506
Agent for Applicants

Fish & Neave IP Group
Ropes & Gray LLP
Customer No. 1473
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020
Tel.: (212) 596-9000